

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 were pending at the time of examination. Claims 1, 9-10, 17 and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-2, 4, 9-10, 12-13, and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,093,194 B2 to Nelson (hereinafter “Nelson”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,821 B1 to Merrill et al. (hereinafter “Merrill”). The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

“A process for setting up the execution of a server-side method by a client-side data processing system for a specific session, comprising:  
creating a session-specific Application Program Interface on the server side for a server-side software method;  
automatically creating an interpreted script language program that contains calls to the server-side software method in accordance with the session-specific Application Program Interface; and  
sending the created interpreted script language program to the client side.”

Claim 1 has been amended to further specify that the Application Program Interface (API) that is created on the server is a session-specific API. As can be seen in the Applicant’s specification, paragraph [0026], and in FIG. 2, “Initially, the Java beans are instantiated on the server side...For each session, beans are registered 200. An API for the server-side methods results from the instantiation 210.” That is, the API is session-specific, as recited in claim 1. Having a session-specific API leads to a number of advantages. For example, as recited in paragraphs [0025] and [0042] of the Applicant’s specification, and as shown in FIG. 5, registering different methods of a Java bean for different client sessions enables different clients to access different subsets of the methods from the same bean class through different APIs. This can be very useful, both in terms of security, and flexibility for the system. Neither Nelson nor Merrill, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests a session-specific API, or discusses any advantages that can be achieved with such a configuration.

Furthermore, as has been discussed in the previous Office Action response, claim 1 is directed to a “process for setting up the execution of a server-side method by a client-side data processing system for a specific session.” The steps recited in claim 1 makes it is possible to avoid user/developer setup on the client whenever changes occur to the server-side methods,

which is otherwise necessary in conventional setups. They also make it possible to do a session-specific setup, so that various parameters, methods, etc. may vary between different sessions. Neither Nelson nor Merrill, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests set up process for client-server communication for a specific session in the manner described in claim 1. Instead, Nelson is directed to “a web-based data access system that allows people to easily access, manipulate and share information” (col.1, lines 35-37). Both Merrill and Nelson assume that the client is already in possession of the information needed to call the methods on their respective servers, and do not discuss how such communications are initially set up for a session. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 17 and 20 contain similar limitations and were rejected for substantially the same reasons as claim 1. The Applicant has made similar amendments to claims 17 and 20 as to claim 1, and submits that at least for the reasons that were discussed above with respect to claim 1, the rejection of claims 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 9, 10, 12-13, and 18-19 depend directly from claims 1 and 17, respectively, and contain further distinguishing limitations. Thus, for at least reasons substantially similar to those set forth above, the Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection of claims 2, 4, 9, 10, 12-13, and 18-19 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Merrill as applied to claim 2, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,955 B2 to Guthrie et al. (hereinafter “Guthrie”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 3 depends directly from claim 2, and is thus neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Nelson and Merrill combination for at least the reasons discussed above. The Examiner acknowledges that Nelson and Merrill, alone or in combination, do not disclose “executing the interpreted script language program includes creating a programming language object having the same name as a server-side programming language bean,” as recited in claim 3, and relies on and “analogous process” in Guthrie for this showing. Guthrie describes “a software system for dynamic generation of remote proxy classes at runtime through a distributed object management system” (Abstract). While Guthrie may describe a system where the proxy objects have the same name as the corresponding server objects, Guthrie does not add any further features that renders claim 2 any more obvious than the Nelson/Merrill combination. Especially, Guthrie does not suggest any session-specific API of the kind discussed above. Since claim 3 depends directly from claim

2, the Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection of claim 3 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2.

Claims 5-8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0218633 A1 to Mikhail et al. (hereinafter “Mikhail”). The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Claim 5 depends directly from claim 1, and is thus neither anticipated nor rendered obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. The Examiner acknowledges that Nelson does not disclose “identifying the registered server-side methods,” as recited by claim 5, and relies on an analogous process in Mikhail for this showing. However, the cited passage of Mikhail describes “specifying a callback method for the desired notification.” This is not the same as identifying the registered server-side methods, as described in claim 5. Thus, for at least these reasons, and the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited art and that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8 depend directly from claim 5. Thus, for reasons substantially similar to those set forth above, the Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection of claims 6-8 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn. Claim 11 depends from claim 1. Thus, for reasons substantially similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, the Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection of claim 11 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner made no mention of dependent claims 14-16 in the rejection, but the Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable as well, at least since they depend indirectly or directly from independent claim 1, which has been discussed above. Furthermore, in the rejection, the Examiner refers to Nelson as patent number 6,188,400 B1, but since this patent does not list Nelson as an inventor, the Applicant has assumed in the above discussion that the Examiner intended to cite U.S. Patent No. 7,093,194 B2 to Nelson, which has been cited in previous Office Actions. Should this not be the case, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned.

### Conclusion

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
MOLLBORN PATENTS

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Fredrik Mollborn".

Fredrik Mollborn  
Reg. No. 48,587

2840 Colby Drive  
Boulder, CO 80305  
(303) 459-4527